Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/535,241	TSUDA, MUNETAKA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Tiffany A Fetzner</u> .	(3)	
(2) Attorney Paul Teng Reg. No. 40,837.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 July 2004	Time: <u>10am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic	cant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 14-35		
Prior art documents discussed: Watkins et al., (i.e the fact that Watkins et al., is not prior art aga	ainst the claims of the instant a	pplication), Warner and Yamaguchi.
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT V	VAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a v	vritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/∆nnlicant's Penresentativ	e Signature – if appropriate)
(Applican	nybhicair a vehieseirann	s Signature – ir appropriatė)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's Attorney because the claims as amended April 19th 2004, did not clearly set forth the limitations argued by applicant in the April 19th 2004 response, because correction of the "local" non-uniformities of the spatial distribution of the additional magnetic field produced by the magnetic field correcting unit was not clearly set forth. In the discussions with applicant's attorney numerous grammatical errors were found. The examiner offered to make an examiner's amendment to the claims to clarify the applicant's argued limitations clearly within applicant's claims, since the argued features are supported by applicant's original disclosure and the Japanese priority decument of March 26th 1999. No new matter was added. The examiner was thanked for her assistance. The applicant was informed that a complete new set of draings including all approved .